E 310
.T53
Copy 1

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

Class ______

Book ______

THE

THREE PATRIOTS;

OR,

THE CAUSE AND CURE

OF

PRESENT EVILS.

ADDRESSED TO THE

VOTERS OF MARYLAND.

Baltimore:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.
B. Edes, printer.
1811.

E 910
.T53

632
T70

THE

THREE PATRIOTS;

OR,

THE CAUSE AND CURE OF PRESENT EVILS.

OUR country presents to the view of an observer a most extraordinary and singular spectacle; raised in the short space of twelve years, from a state of almost universal bankruptcy and national weakness, to a high degree of wealth and national consideration; and, in less than the ten next succeeding years, reduced to a worse condition than that from which it had been raised.

It is my intention in the following pages, 1st, to trace the progress of the causes by which it has been depressed, and then, 2dly, to show by what simple means it may be restored to its once enviable situation.

With respect to the first head.

To trace the causes which have reduced our country to its present situation, it is necessary we should revert to the time when our constitution was submitted to the people for their adoption or rejection. The Americans of that day had fought side by side, and by their army and efforts achieved their liberty and independence. Attached alike to the *same principles of government* when the constitution was discussed, they only differed, as a writer of the times well observed, about the mode of organizing its parts and arranging its powers. After a severe struggle, the constitution was re-

ceived as it came from the hands of the convention, and General Washington elected president. During this contest, its advocates were distinguished by the term of federalists, its opposers by that of anti-federalists.

The first congress had proceeded but a little way in the career of legislation, when it became evident to observers, that the anti-federalists (then the minority in that body) had determined on getting the government wholly into their own hands. As a means to arrive at this end, new party names were sought for and invented, which, being applied as terms of reproach, should inflame the minds of the ignorant against men hitherto without reproach. The anti-federalists thenceforth represented their opponents as monarchists and aristocrats, whose object it was, "to impose on the people the substance, as they had already the form of the British government," and themselves as *democrats* or patriots, whose sole wish was to preserve the constitution from such impurity.

A brisk traffic was now commenced with the terms monarchist and aristocrat, and a thousand minute arts and small pedlars were employed to carry them from door to door, and to the most remote nooks and corners of the union.

Those who introduced the use of these terms, well knew their inapplicability to the views of the parties they were intended to designate, but they knew also that the many are always more ready to believe than to examine. Let us now attend to their real import, in order to determine with what propriety they are applied.

A *democracy*, according to the best writers, is a government where the people *collectively*, or successively in small bodies, assemble at certain periods, to enact laws; a majority of the *whole votes* of the state deciding, as was practised at Athens and other independent cities in Greece—An aristocracy where the power of making laws and trying offences is lodged *exclusively* with the *rich* or *nobles*—A *monarchy* where the supreme power is lodged in a *single person*.

It is evident that the government of the United States belongs to neither of these forms. It is not a democracy, for the people cannot enact laws in a body or seriatim, by a majority of their own votes; but in as much as they *elect* persons who *make the laws*, it partakes of the principles of democracy. It is not an *aristocracy*, for the *rich exclusively* have no right to make laws; but as it vests the law-making power under restrictions in citizens of certain ages, to be chosen by the people, and excludes from the exercise of this power, all under the prescribed age, so far it partakes of the principle of aristocracy. Lastly, it is not a monarchy, for the president is not the *depositary* of the supreme power; in as much, however, as he is vested with certain *kingly* prerogatives, the government, so far participates in the principle of monarchy. It follows that our government is neither the one nor the other. What then is it? A *federative republic*; federative, because composed of several states independant in certain respects, and united in others; a republic, because made up of the principles of different forms, the name given to all mixed governments by that great master in politics, Aristotle. Hence Mr. Jefferson, in a moment of sincerity, declared to the people "We have called, by different names, brethren of the same *principle*. We are all federalists—we are all republicans."*

As our constitution of government then, is neither an aristocracy, monarchy, nor democracy, no citizen, without offending against its nature, can call himself a monarchist, aristocrat or democrat.

To dissipate the error which has given currency to these terms is of great importance, in as much as any change in the proportion of the blended powers of the constitution (an easy result from their use) must lead to its destruction. The fate of a hundred republics might be cited to convince you of this truth; but instead of tiring you with examples, I shall relate a short anecdote or dialogue.

* See his inaugural speech

The day the convention finished their labours, and before the constitution was promulgated, Dr. Franklin, who was a member of that body, met with Mrs. Powel, of Philadelphia, a lady remarkable for her understanding and wit.

" Well, Doctor," said the lady on his entering the room, " We are happy to see you abroad again: pray what have we got?" " A republic, madam, if you can keep it." " And why not keep a good thing," said the lady, " when we have got it?" " Because madam," replied the Doctor, " there is in all republics a certain ingredient, of which the people having once tasted, think they can never get enough."

Observe, I pray you, how the doctor's warning has been verified in France. The people of that country, not aware of the march of democracy, thought they saw the dawn of liberty in the demolition of the Bastile. When the king was removed from Versailles to Paris amidst the exclamations of fish women, it seemed to them to approach nearer day. He was beheaded; monarchic and aristocratic blood ran in streams from the guillotine in every quarter of the kingdom; then the sun of liberty ascended to the horizon. The reign of Robespierre took place: this too, was to increase its effulgence. The christian Sabbath was abolished, the Tiara trampled under foot, and the Pope dragged from Rome and marched triumphantly into France. This procedure was strange, but still it was applauded. One constitution followed fast on the heels of another, the last always the best. One set of patriots deposed another set, the last always the greatest patriots. At length Bonaparte became the depositary of the peoples' rights, first as consul and last as emperor.

Reflect, my fellow citizens, I beseech you, upon these events. Where is the democratic show and scenery, that glittered on the shores of France, that dazzled your eyes and bewildered your imaginations? Vanished into air. Where the sun of liberty? Set. The temple of reason? Destroyed. The imprescriptible rights of man? No where to be found. All that you delighted in seeing torn up by the roots, as monarchic and aristocratic, you behold again re-

placed in their most dreaded forms, by a tyrant whose little finger bears heavier on a wretched people, than the loins of all their former monarchs.

Whilst the impression of these images yet harrowed the imagination, and the usurpation of Bonaparte inflamed the mind almost to madness against tyrants, Mr. Jefferson proclaimed in a message to congress "France has an enlightened government."

If we would secure our government from the fate of all its predecessors, we must unite our endeavours to preserve its principles in their well adjusted proportions, and be careful not to add one grain more of democracy to its ingredients.

Examine, now, I pray you, with as little prepossession as possible, the character and actions of those men you have been taught to look upon as "the advocates of aristocracy, monarchy, hereditary succession, a titled nobility, and all the mock pageantry of kingly government." Some are your neighbours, others your acquaintantance. Many you have known from childhood. Can you point to an individual among them, who has endeavoured to instil into you a love for a monarchy or aristocracy, or who has laboured to disgust you with your constitution? Be candid; have those who advocated the adoption of the government, done any act since, which evinces an abatement of attachment to it? Are they not (as many of them are still living) the same now that they were then, devoted to the constitution, and inimical only to whatever would alter it in its principles or form. Look now to those calling themselves democrats; pay the same attention to their way of thinking, and you will not discover, perhaps one among them who understands the meaning of the term and is not under the influence of sinister views, that would willingly agree to exchange the government for a democracy. Let this scrutiny be conducted dispassionately, and my life for it, you will be convinced, that excepting demagogues and office-hunters, who are ready to sacrifice every

thing to advance their purposes, native Americans are "All federalists all republicans."

Why then you ask, have certain men of acknowleaged understanding (whom you could name) taken such pains to induce the multitude to believe that all federalists were monarchists in disguise.

I have already observed that after the adoption of the constitution, the reins of goverment were placed by the suffrages of the people in the hands of the federalists. We had at that time, as we have now, certain ambitious men who thirsted after power, and were determined at whatever price, to obtain it. To oust the federalists from the government it was indispensable to destroy their character by presenting them to the public under aspects calculated to effect this object. The moment this was determined on, is the date of the party terms monarchist and aristocrat. At first these appellations were used sparingly and bestowed only on a few leading federalists, when an unexpected occurrence brought into action the whole machinery of party.

Many of you will recollect that in the summer of 1790, president Washington was seised with a disorder which threatened his life. Whispers now began to circulate respecting a successor. Among the candidates talked of was Mr. Jefferson. From this time the opposition considered him their chief. From this time new Gazettes were seen to start up in different parts of the Union, all diffusing sentiments of a similar tendency as if animated by the same mind.

Perhaps no one person that has figured on the American political theatre is better acquainted than Mr. Jefferson with the powers of the press, whether applied to unsettle the minds of a people in matters of religion or government. His residence in France, and his association while there, with Condorcet and others, the allies of Voltaire, in the great work then going forward against government and religion, had initiated him into all its mysteries. He had left the French news papers and pamphlets, issued under their direction, in

the full tide of successful experiment, and he had seen as he himself tells a friend "three insurrections" in that country "in the three years he had been there."* His skill gave system to opposition, his science settled with unfeeling precision the principles which were to render our fairest characters suspected, and virtue itself odious in the eyes of the multitude.

This system, as you will soon perceive, met with the utmost exactitude, the wishes of France. Whatever France did, it approved. Whatever France desired, it was ready to grant. One establishment only was wanting to render its efficacy certain. A paper to which every other should look for the signals that were to direct their several manœuvres. Mr. Philip Freneau a man of some literary reputation being fixed on as a fit person to conduct such a paper, was accordingly attracted from New York to Philadelphia, and placed by Mr. Jefferson in the Department of State as a translator of foreign languages at a salary of two hundred dollars per annum. Such was his ostentible appointment, but his real business the editing of a newspaper which immediately appeared under the imposing title of the National Gazette.

This Gazette, the first pensioned newspaper in the United States since the adoption of the Federal Government, continued in existence from the 31st of October, 1791, till Mr. Jefferson retired from office in 1794. And though conducted *under the eye of this officer*, it does not exhibit throughout its numerous pages one solitary paragraph in praise of the freest government in the world, on the contrary they are filled with misrepresentations and abuse of the measures and motives of the majority of both Houses of Congress, invectives against the heads of the Treasury and War Departments and the most virulent calumnies of the president

* The extracts of a letter containing this information are dated 20th December, 1787. They were read by Mr. Madison in the Virginia convention and afterwards published.

himself, all tending in their tenor and object to produce national disgrace, insignificance and disorder.

In September 1792, the Boston Chronicle (an antifederal paper conducted by Mr. Adams) recommended a general perusal of this Gazette to the people of New England in the following words: "As the friends of civil liberty wish at all times to be acquainted with every question which appears to regard the public weal, a great number of gentlemen, in this and the neighbouring towns, have subscribed for the National Gazette, published by Mr. Philip Freneau at Philadelphia. And it is hoped, that Freneau's Gazette, which is said to be printed under the eye of that established patriot and republican, Thomas Jefferson, will be generally taken in the New England states."

Genet's arrival in this country in 1793, gave a new spring to this class of papers. "To draw the United States into the war against England, was the great object of his mission; and *in case he found the American Executive not sufficiently yielding, he was to employ the people*, (as had been done in other countries,) TO OVERTHROW THAT DEPARTMENT, *or oblige it to be subservient to their plans.*"* Such were his instructions. How faithfully he followed them we shall shew from public documents which are open for every person to consult.

"On the declaration of war between France and England, the United States being at peace with both, their situation was so new and unexperienced by themselves, that their citizens were not in the first instance sensible of the new duties resulting therefrom and of the restraints it would impose even on their dispositions towards the belligerent powers. Some of them imagined (and chiefly their transient sea faring citizens,) that they were free to indulge their dispositions, to take side with either party, and enrich themselves by depredations on the commerce of the

* See his private instructions published by himself in his justification, December, 1793.

other, and were meditating enterprises of this nature, as there was reason to believe. In this state of the public mind, and before it should take an erroneous direction difficult to be set right, and dangerous to themselves, and their country, the president thought it expedient, through the channel of a proclamation, to remind our fellow citizens, that we were in a state of peace with all the belligerent powers; that in that state it was our duty, neither to aid nor injure any; to exhort and warn them against acts which might contravene this duty, and particularly those of positive hostility, for the punishment of which the laws would be appealed to; and to put them on their gaurd also as to the risk they would run, if they should attempt to carry contraband articles to any. This proclamation was ordered on the 19th, and signed on the 22d of April, (1793).

"On the day of its publication the president received through the channel of the newspapers the first intimation, that Mr. Genet had arrived on the 8th of the month at Charleston, in character of minister plenipotentiary, from his nation to the United States, and soon after that he had sent on to Philadelphia, the vessel in which he came, and would himself perform the journey by land. His landing at one of the most distant ports of the Union, from his points both of departure and destination, was calculated to excite attention, and very soon afterwards we learnt, that he was undertaking to authorise the fitting and arming vessels in that port, enlisting men, foreigners and citizens, and giving them commissions to cruise and commit hostilities on nations at peace with us; that these vessels were taking and bringing prizes into our ports; that the consuls of France were assuming to hold courts of admirality on them, to try, condemn, and authorise their sale as legal prize; and all this before Mr. Genet had presented himself, or his credentials to the president, before he was received by him, without his consent or consultation, and directly in contravention of the state of peace existing and declared to exis in the presidents proclamation, and incumbent on him to

preserve till the constitutional authority should otherwise declare."*

Genet held for sound doctrine, "that the French enjoyed a right to arm in our ports, and to inlist our citizens, and that government had no right to restrain them—That our courts could take no cognizance of questions whether vessels held by the French as prizes, were lawful or not; that the jurisdiction belonged exclusive to the French consulate in America—That the English had no right under the laws to take French property out of American vessels, and that the president had undertaken to decide by his proclamation of neutrality, what belonged to the decision of congress, and that congress ought to have been convened for the purpose of making such decision. †

In favour of those doctrines so destructive of the sovereignty of the nation and against the proclamation of neutrality, Mr. Jefferson's Gazette took a decided stand, reprobating that wise and necessary measure in the most scurrilous terms, and charging the president with the commission of an *illegal act*, and a flagrant violation of the constitution.

This paper did not stop here. Two Americans having been prosecuted for violating the neutrality, by entering on board a French privateer, it accused the president of cruelly and illegally imprisoning innocent men, "for having generously forsook their country to assist the cause of liberty in France."

Again, on the 20th July, under the signature of Juba; "I hope the minister of France will act with firmness and with spirit: the *people* are his *friends*, or the friends of France, and he will have nothing to apprehend, for as yet the people are the sovereigns of the United States."

To aid this war upon the government other papers were

* See letter to Mr. Morris at Paris, requiring the recall of Mr. Genet.

† See Genet s letters to the secretary of state, published by order of congress.

inlisted. Bache's General Advertiser (now the Aurora) under the signature of "a Jacobin" affirmed "it was no longer possible to doubt the intention of the executive was to look upon the treaty of France as a nullity, and that the government was preparing to join the league of kings against France." The Boston Chronicle (the paper before mentioned) also declared "all opposition to Genet to be the voice of toryism proclaimed by the organs of aristocracy."

When the impropriety of keeping in his office the editor of a newspaper thus incessantly employed against the government was urged upon the friends of Mr. Jefferson, the only apology they offered was, "Mr. Jefferson could not, in a free country, controul the publication of any paper," when it was added, "he surely at least had it in his power to put an end to the connection between them, by dismissing him:" this it was said, "would be to punish a man for his independence."

It cannot be supposed that the president could remain insensible to these attempts to produce disorder in the government, and rob him of the affections of the people. In public, it is true, he noticed them not, but in a private letter to general Lee, then governor of Virginia, he shews that he felt them, "for the result says he, as it respects myslf, I care not. I have a consolation within, of which no earthly efforts can deprive me; and that is, that neither ambitious nor interested motives have influenced my conduct. The arrows of malevolence therefore, however barbed and pointed, can never reach my most valuable part; though whilst I am *up* as a *mark*, they will be continually aiming at me. The publications in *Freneau's* and *Bache's* papers, are outrages on common decency; and they progress in that style in proportion as their pieces are treated with contempt, and passed over with silence by those against whom they are directed. Their tendency, however, is too obvious to be mistaken by men of cool and dispassionate minds: and in my opinion ought to alarm them; because it is difficult to prescribe bounds to their effect."

The president submitted to his cabinet in 1793, a set of queries, previous to Genet's arrival, the answers to which were to enable him to form a system for regulating the general conduct of the United States towards the belligerents.

These queries with some of the answers to them found their way into Bache's paper, and its confederate prints, and gave rise to a series of essays, from which was poured out the most bitter invectives against the president.

As this state-paper was entirely confidential, Mr. Jefferson some years after, addressed a letter to the president, to exculpate himself from having had any agency in its publication. The answer to this letter, after relieving Mr. Jefferson from the heavy charge of perfidy, concludes with these memorable words: "To this I may add, and very truly, that until the last year or two, I had no conception that parties would, or even could go the lengths I have been witness: nor did I believe until lately, that it was within the bounds of probability, hardly within those of possibility, that while I was using my utmost exertions to establish a national character of our own, independent as far as our obligations and justice would permit, of every nation of the earth; and wished by steering a steady course, to preserve this country from the horrors of a dessolating war, I should be accused of being the enemy of one nation and subject to the influence of another; and to prove it, that every act of my administration would be tortured, and the grossest and most insidious misrepresentations of them made, by giving one side only of a subject, and that too, in such exaggerated and indecent terms as could scarcely be applied to a Nero—to a notorious defaulter—or even to a common pick-pocket."

Would that it were possible, I could here describe Mr. Jeffersons feelings on reading this letter. That they were only momentary is most probable, for his newspaper machinery, intermitted not for a day its accustomed avocations.

Mr. Jefferson at this time, pretended to lead the life of a philosopher. Far abstracted from the world, on the heights of Monticello, even newspapers were forbidden entrance in-

to his retirement, lest they might disturb the tranquil hours of contemplatiton. This deceived some; but it was soon manifest that, what he had sown he intended to reap. The newspapers which had received from his hand their original impulse, he still continued to direct. In 1796, three years after this fictitious seclusion from all political concerns, he was elected vice president, having lost the presidency but by two votes.

On the day (fourth of March) general Washington retired from office, his successor Mr. Adams, as president, and Mr. Jefferson as vice president, delivered each an inaugural speech before the senate. Mr. Jefferson on this occasion, speaking of Mr. Adams says, "no one more sincerely prays that no accident may call me to the higher and more important functions which the constitution eventually devolves upon this office. These have been justly confided to the eminent character who has preceded me here, whose talents and integrity have been known and revered by me through a long course of years; have been the foundation of a cordial and uninterrupted friendship between us; and I devoutly pray he may be long preserved for the government, the happiness and prosperity of our common country."

These words of honied import, were well received by Mr. Adams, but believed by no one else. A commentary that could not be misunderstood, was soon after given to the public.

Bache's paper had succeeded to Freneau's, but Bache without help was weak, but willing. Mr. Duane was now in Philadelphia, and had exhibited his talents in a defamatory letter to general Wahington upon his farewell address, under the fictitious signature of Jasper Dwight. This performance, in which the president was grossly abused, and some biting paragraphs which had appeared in Bache's paper, brought him into notice. Starving however in Philadelphia, he contemplated removing to Pittsburgh. To keep him where he was, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, and about a dozen of their friends entered into a subscription, deemed

by him at that time, ample compensation for his labours. In his dispute (in 1802) with Callender for quarrelling with Mr. Jefferson, Duane was induced to part with his secret, in order to recover the merit of certain paragraphs that this hireling scribe had claimed a right in. Touching this subject Duane observes, in a reply to Callender, published first September, 1802 ; " For the satisfaction of others, I will further explain the origin of the subscription which was entered into by about twenty individuals in Philadelphia. The origin of the subscription was wholly personal, *calculated* to detain me in this city, under the impression that *I could render more essential service than in the western parts of the state.*"

A few samples will be sufficient to convey to the reader an idea of the kind of services he was paid to render.

The day general Washington retired from the presidency is noticed in the Aurora in the following strain of profanity and abuse. " Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation," was the pious ejaculation of a man who beheld a flood of happiness rushing in upon mankind: if ever there was a time that would licence the reiteration of the exclamation, that time is now arrived, for the man who is the source of all the misfortunes of our country, is this day reduced to a level with his fellow citizens, and is no longer possessed of power to multiply evils upon the United States. If ever there was a period for rejoicing, this is the moment. Every heart in unison with the freedom and happiness of the people ought to beat high with exultation, that the name of Washington from this day ceases to give currency to political iniquity, and to legalise corruption. A new æra is opening upon us, an æra that promises much to the people, for public measures must now stand upon their own merits, and nefarious projects can no longer be supported by a name. When a retrospect is taken of the Washington administration for eight years, it is a subject of the greatest astonishment, that a single individual could have cankered the prin-

ciples of republicanism in an enlightened people, and should have carried his designs against the public liberty, so far as to have put in jeopardy its very existence. Such however are the facts, and with these staring us in the face, this day ought to be a jubilee in the United States."

I would not swear this was written, though claimed by Duane. It is enough to know who paid for it and for whom it was written.

That eminent character, long known and revered for talents and integrity, and for whose life a solemn prayer was offered up before the assembled people, "that it might be long preserved for the government, the happiness and prosperity of our common country," is thus noticed in the same paper. "America, whether she will or no, is destined to occupy a superior station at no very distant period in the sublunary drama; and truly it would be ludicrous to suppose that the querelous and cankered murmurs of blind, bald, crippled, toothless Adams, or the venal machinations of the executive tide waiters, cake catchers, meat mongers, bubble gulpers, Sewalls, Otis's, &c. can have any other effect than to afford additional and experimental proof of the folly of trusting such men with power."

The treatment of our ministers by France in 1797, and 1798, the general and indignant sensation it excited throughout the United States, cannot be forgotten. On this occasion Mr. Jefferson wrote to his correspondents in various parts of the country, suggesting to them, that the *Aurora* was in danger of suffering from its attachment to the cause of France, and recommending a *patriotic* effort to be made in its favour. A hint being given in the Gazette of the United States of this attempt to procure for it *new* and additional subscribers,* there immediately came out in the Aurora an avowal and boast of his patronage.

Mr. Jefferson's next ascertained purchase was of Callender, for his book entitled, "The Prospect before Us," published in the year 1800.

* June 1798.

The letters he addressed to Callender which substantiate this fact, were lodged by him, for inspection, in the office of the Virginia Gazette, in Richmond, in 1802, and published in most of the federal papers of that day In Mr. Jefferson's letters to Callender, dated Monticello, 6th September, 1799, he informs him " Mr. Jefferson (his brother) happens to be here, and directs his agent to call on you with this, and pay you fifty dollars *on account* of the book you are about to publish. When it shall be out, be so good as to send me two or three copies, and the rest only when I shall ask for them." In his next, dated 6th October, 1799, " I thank you for the proof sheets you inclosed me. Such papers cannot fail to produce the *best effect.* They inform the thinking part of the nation, and they again, supported by the tax gatherers, as their vouchers, *set the people to rights.*"

As this book may not be in many of your hands, the following quotations from it may serve to give you an idea of the nature of the " papers which were to produce the best effect, and set the people to rights."

Callender begins with shewing that " the federal constitution was crammed down the gullet of America."

After noticing certain arguments which he says were used to procure its adoption, he adds " thus the five principal inducements to accept the constitution are proved by common sense, or experience, to have been absolutely chimerical, and nothing better than hobbyhorses."

" Hence it follows that the new government was only preferred by a *part* of the people." " In Virginia this constitution met not only with violent, but with at least equiponderant opposition. In all the other states the people were greatly divided. All the atrocious artifices common at an ordinary election, were exerted in support of it. The five main articles advanced in its favour have, as above, been separately *weighed in the balance and found wanting.* That the federal system had been embraced by the *whole* people never was, nor could be pretended. Yet the first federal

congress met in defiance of the constitution then existing." "They met on the ruins of the old constitution, and sacrificed a variety of rights hitherto held as inviolable. They met, when, out of the thirteen states, eleven only had acceded to the union."

"This goverment met with long and violent resistance to its adoption. In Virginia it was carried by eighty nine votes against twenty one. From ten to thirteen of the majority, have long since repented of their vote. Most of those evils predicted in the debates at Richmond, have been minutely fulfilled. As for what a federal senate was to become, George Mason foretold the whole. In Massachusetts the federal question was carried by 178 against 168. Georgia was poor and helpless. Her delegates were unanimous for adoption. They did not foresee the Washington plan of defending or rather deserting the south-western frontiers. In New York the constitution was accepted by 30 voices against 25. In Rhode Island, by a majority of two. In North Carolina it was at first rejected by a large majority."

"The longer we examine, the harder we shall find it to prove what America gained by this government."

These sentiments could not fail of being acceptable to Mr. Jefferson; for if not still anti-federal, he had been unquestionably opposed to the constitution, in some of its most important features, so much so, as to have discountenanced its adoption altogether without previous amendments.*

Again. "But worst of all general Washington himself, consented to officiate, in a government which he flatly declares to have been an usurpation. For on March the 3d, 1789, when the congress first assembled, they bore about them every feature that corresponds with the definition of traitors, as just quoted from Mr. Washington himself. (his

* See partial extracts from Mr. Jefferson's letters dated Paris, 1788 and 1789, published by a friend with a view to his vindication.

farewell address.) Such is the consistency of his theory with his practice.—The farewell address conveys an explicit censure not only upon the new government but likewise upon the American revolution; for that also was accomplished by a part of the people, in despite of the rest, and in breach of what is called the British constitution. By his own account, therefore, Mr. Washington has been twice a traitor. He first renounced the King of England, and thereafter the old confederation. This farewell paper contains a variety of mischievous sentiments." "By the way it is incomprehensible how Mr. Washington came to think he had any call to write such a letter."

This same farewell letter, as before noted, was attacked by Duane under the signature of Jasper Dwight, who was rewardad like Callender, and by the same hand. Why these repeated attempts upon this legacy, as it is called, of the excellent Washington? Callender acknowledges "it was received in America with general rapture." Why did he not yield to his judgment, rather than his necessities, and acknowledge also, that a strict adherence to what it advises, and avoidance of what it condemns can alone insure happiness to the people and perpetuity to the union. To return to our quotations.

"The extravagant popularity possessed by this citizen (general Washington) reflects the utmost ridicule on the discernment of America. He approved of the funding system, the assumption, the national bank, and in contradiction of his own solemn promise, he authorised the robbery and ruin of the remnant of his own army."

"Under the old confederation, matters never were, nor could have been conducted so wretchedly, as they actually are, and have been under the successive monarchs of Braintree and Mount Vernon."

"For the first four years the chief employment both of Hamilton and congress was to break the constitution.

"For entering into a commercial treaty with England,

getting it accepted by two thirds of the senate and publishing it as the law of the land, before the subject had ever come before the House of Representatives, he (president Washington) could not have committed a more net and pure violation of his oath to preserve the constitution, and of his official trust."

"The wretched proclamation of neutrality of April 22, 1793, was most likely communicated to *Pitt*, long before it was openly proposed in the cabinet of America."

"The proclamation of neutrality does not deserve that title. It was a proclamation of ignorance and pusillanimity."

Again. "The name of Jefferson appears at the bottom of the proclamation of neutrality, but we must not from thence infer that he approved of it."

"The tardiness and timidity of Washington were succeeded by the rancour and insolence of Mr. Adams."

"Mr. Adams has only completed the scene of ignominy which Mr. Washington began."

"Foremost in what is detestable, Mr. Adams feels anxiety to curb the frontier population."

"Instead of making so much needless noise while in office, Mr. Adams ought to be as calm as he can be. We must admit that he is president of the union, but we cannot forget the way in which he become so." Then follows an enumeration of his crimes in the eyes of the writer. "When you have digested these reflections contemplate the history of the present year, think what you have been, what you are, and what under the monarch of Massachusetts, you are like to become."

We now approach to the burthen of the book.

Overlooking Mr. Jefferson's long friendship for Mr. Adams, as Duane had done, forgetful of his prayer that he might be long preserved for the government, the happiness and prosperity of their common country, he calls out, "with these reflections you will look forward to October,

1800. You will then as Tacitus expresses it, think of your ancestors and your posterity. You will then take your choice between innocence and guilt, between freedom and slavery, between paradise and perdition. You will choose between the man who has deserted and reversed all his principles and that man

" Whose own example strengthens all his laws. That man whose predictions like those of Henry, have been converted into history. You will choose between that man whose life is unspotted by a crime, and *that* man whose hands are reeking with the blood of the poor friendless Connecticut sailor! I see the tear starting on your cheeks. You anticipate the name of John Adams."

By such means as these, the choice spirits which had opposed the adoption of the constitution were reanimated against it, and all who were its advocates; and all who had administered the government, rendered suspected and odious in the eyes of the people. By such means Mr. Jefferson was at length lifted into the presidency.

Who are those men that stand silent and apart, branded as " monarchists, aristocrats, public plunderers and traitors: and he of elevated port proclaimed " a legaliser of corruption," that " carried his designs against public liberty so far as to put in jeopardy its very existence?" Are they not the very men who fought and bled for liberty, who toiled to frame for you a free government; who exercised its powers so as to extend the fame and commerce of our country far beyond its boundaries: and is not that noble figure at their head, the immortal Washington! me thinks I hear a murmur among you. " Yes," they are sounds of regret and sorrow. I knew that an indulgent people would render justice to the dead and the living, that sooner or later, they would acknowledge them the authors of that flourishing commerce, that general prosperity and that national consideration which a different set of actors have so nearly destroyed.

The rulers of France under every change of her government, have considered the United States as a kind of dependency torn by their arms from Great Britain, which they had a right to use as their policy or interest dictated.

In no instance has France, regal, republican, or imperial, done aught to promote the interests of this country with other view than as it promoted her own.

It was not till 1779, more than a year and an half after our declaration of independence, and after we had *decisively* proved by the battles of 1775, 1776 and 1777, our *ability* to maintain it, this independence was acknowledged by France and a treaty of alliance formed with her.

From this period, France endeavoured to identify herfelf, as it were, with our national councils and so far succeeded as to obtain from congress a resolution by which our ministers were instructed, in the formation of treaties, to be guided by "the advice of the French court."

With this authority over the most precious concerns of our country, while we were labouring to strengthen our interest by treaties with other nations, she was obstructing our efforts by artifice and intrigue, with a view to confine our intercourse to those states whose governments were subject to her direction.

We have the concurrent testimony of Dr. Franklin, Mr. Jay, and Mr. Adams, that, during the negociations which led to the treaty of 1783, with Great Britain, she countenanced our enemy in requiring the insertion of an offensive article, and afterwards, by her sub-agents here, made this very article the instrument of discontent and faction. She also endeavoured to deprive us of a great extent of our territory, and to exclude us altogether, form the fishery on the grand bank of New Foundland.

In reference to these facts, the national convention of France, informs their minister Genet, in his instructions dated the 4th January, 1793.*

* These instructions were published by Genet, in December 1793, in vindication of his extraordinary measures.

" The executive council has called for the instructions given to citizen Genet's predecessors in America, and has seen in them, with indignation, that at the very time the good people of America expressed their gratitude to us in the most feeling maner, and gave us every proof of their friendship, Vergennes and Montmorin thought that it was right for France to hinder the United States from taking that political stability of which they were capable ; because they would soon acquire a strength, which, it was probable they would be eager to abuse." " The same Machiavelian principle influenced the operations of war for independence : the same duplicity reigned over the negociations for peace."

Thus we see from the records of the French cabinet, that the support afforded to the United States, in their struggle for independence, was the consequence of a base speculation ; that our rising glory offended the ambitious views of France, that her ambassadors bore the criminal order of stopping the career of our prosperity ; and that her aids in arms and money were given from a desire to humble a rival power, and the better to assure her own relative greatness.

If we turn again to these instructions, we shall find in them designs no less inimical towards the United States, than those ascribed to the ancient government. By them Mr. Genet is directed to employ every possible means to plunge us into the war *per fas aut nefas*,* to assist in which object, he brought with him near a million of dollars, the last of which were drawn from their depositary on the very day his successor, Fauchet, arrived at the seat of government.

These facts no informed man will venture to call in question. The evidences of them constitute a *part* of our public records. They are also matter of history, and thus stand secure against the element of fire.

We mention it with profound regret, that France, from the time her influence in the councils of congress, obtained in-

* Vide his instructions.

structions to our ministers abroad, subjecting our precious interests to her disposal, down to the present period, has maintained an influence in our country, the consequences of which may, if not guarded against by the people, prove finally fatal to our prosperity and independence.

" Perhaps" said the agent of Talleyrand to our ministers Pinkney, Marshall and Gerry, " you believe that in returning and exposing to your countrymen the unreasonableness of the demands of this government, you will unite them in their resistance to these demands ; you are mistaken: you ought to know the diplomatic skill of France ; and the *means* she possesses in your country are sufficient to enable her, with the *French party* in America, to throw the blame which will attend the rupture of the negociation on the *federatists* as you term yourselves, but on the *British party* as *France terms you.*"

It may not be improper to advance a little further in the elucidation of this point. The leading feature of the French party is the same in whatever country it exists. The Dutch *patriots* did not wish us to depart from our neutrality, lest it should interrupt the payment of the interest on their monies loaned to the United States: nevertheless at the *instance of France*, they urged that we should not suffer the English to carry off with impunity from on board American vessels the property of Batavians, and invited us " to make common cause with them and the French republic, against the despotism of proud Albion." Mr. John Adams who transmitted the paper containing this demand upon our government, in a letter to the secretary of state, dated Hague, Nov. 4, 1796, observed, " The general disposition even of the *patriotic party* (the party in power) favours cordially and sincerely the neutrality of the United States. But they can have no avowed will different from that which may give satisfaction to the government of France. They feel a *dependance* so absolute and *irremovable* upon their good will, that they sacrifice every other inclination, and silence every other interest when the pleasure of the French government is sig-

nified to them, in such manner as makes an election necessary."

In a debate in the counsel of elders, on the subject of imports, DUPONT, a leading member, said "Will not the Americans be dissatisfied to see us treat their principle staple (tobacco) with this financial severity and punic infidelity. At what a moment are we inviting upon ourselves these charges? at the time when Washington is retiring from public life, and his successor is to be named as the depositary of the executive power. Two parties divide that republic. One is attached to France by gratitude for her services; the other is attached to England. The latter obtained the advantage by *two votes* only on the discussion on the treaty of commerce with England; and this was *owing to a political error of our own government.* But the triumph of the English party, relative to the treaty, has rendered the *French party* more popular, and affords a strong hope of seeing the future president, the successor of Washington, chosen from the citizens *who are known as the friends of France.*"

Who were the patriotic party in Flanders, Holland, Italy, Switzerland, &c. all those citizens who were devoted to France. What now is the state of these countries? They are either dependent or constituent parts of the great empire. Germany and Prussia had also their *patriots.* Now Germany trembles within the grasp of Bonaparte, and Prussia scarce exists in name. Spain too had a patriotic party, who sent her own troops abroad and admitted into her bosom French armies: and what have not her people suffered, and, what may they not have yet to suffer from the acts of this *patriotic party?*

That we have *patriots* in the United States, in the French acceptation of the term, is no less certain, than that Mr. Jefferson established Freneau's paper, Mr. Madison is president and Mr. Monroe secretary of state.

When Genet was made acquainted with his recall, he addressed a letter to Mr. Jefferson, dated 18th September, 1793, in which he upbraids the secretary for "having ren-

dered himself the generous instrument of his recall, after having initiated him into mysteries which had inflamed his hatred against all those who aspire to absolute power." And again, in the same letter, cast in his teeth the imputation of having "an official language and a language confidential."

These expressions proclaim how greatly he was hurt at the secretary lending his pen on this occasion, and that he considered the procedure as a defection from the cause.

This abandonment, however, was not considered as real by his more prudent predecessor, Fauchet. This minister as appears from his intercepted letter, still reckoned Mr. Jefferson among the "patriots" (to use his own phrase) "worthy of that imposing title."

Here it may be asked, why did Mr. Jefferson retire from office? The minister just mentioned says, "having foreseen certain crises, he prudently retired in order to avoid making a figure against his inclinations in scenes the secret of which will soon or late be brought to light."

"The western people," he observes in the same letter, "calculated on being supported by some distinguished characters in the east, and even imagined they had in the bosom of the government some abettors who might share in their grievances or their principles."

The crises alluded to in the letter, and foreseen by Mr. Jefferson, were obviously no other, than the unhappy events then passing or calculated to take place soon or late in our country. The western insurrection Mr. Fauchet avers, in this letter, was indubitably connected with a general explosion, but which, he observed, that local and *precipitate* eruption would cause to miscarry, or at least would check for a considerable time. He also states, that a gentleman of no common sagacity had presaged "either a revolution or civil war." The first he says "was preparing in the public mind," but the secret of the scenes which was soon or late to be brought to light, he leaves to be conjectured from the premises. What think you, my countrymen, was the duty of an *American patriot* at the helm of state having a knowledge,

in any degree, of these matters about to happen? Was it to withdraw in order to avoid making a figure against his inclinations, or to have remained at his post, and occupied himself in discountenancing or preventing their occurring? When Mr. Jefferson at length ascended to the presidency, good men remembering these things saw with surprise, a person who had figured in "these scenes" called to fill one of the first offices in his gift.

We find another proof, that his attachment to France remained unimpaired, in his celebrated letter to Mazzei, published at Florence, where Mazzei resided, and republished in the Moniteur in 1798. After enumerating the *enemies of liberty*, evidently including in the number General Washington, and observing, that the mass of weight and riches of its defenders left them nothing to fear, to secure it, he adds, "It suffices that we arrest that system of *ingratitude* and *injustice* towards France from which they would *alienate* us."

To understand the full import of this passage, it will be proper to examine in what consisted our ingratitude to France.

The whole of our debt for loans and supplies received from France in the American war, amounted to nearly fifty-three millions of livres. Of this debt the old congress discharged only two and an half millions, leaving fifty and an half millions to be provided for by the new government. It appears from documents published by order of the house of representatives in 1793 (a few weeks before Mr. Jefferson resigned) that the men he accused of ingratitude and injustice towards France, in the course of two years, by unceasing exertion, had paid up seven years arrearages and instalments of this debt, which the inefficacy of the old government had suffered to accumulate; that it had facilitated to Mr. Genet, the instalment of 1793, to enable him to send relief to his fellow citizens in France, threatened with famine; and, in the first moment of the insurrection, in the colony of Saint Domingo, had stepped forward to give relief with arms and money. It appears further, by documents published by

order of the house of representatives in 1797, that the whole remaining debt was discharged by successive *anticipations* by the year 1795, notwithstanding *ten millions* did not become due till within the years 1796 and 1802. All this was done while Washington was president, and Hamilton secretary of the treasury; besides granting to France the exclusive admission to sell her prizes in our ports, though not stipulated for in our treaties, and unfounded in her own practice, or that of other nations. Do these acts savour of ingratitude and injustice towards France? Certainly the contrary. Something else then must have been meant by Mr. Jefferson.

The historian of the life of Washington has justly observed, after a careful inspection of this great man's private papers, and an impartial view of his public acts, that his "attachment to the French nation was as strong as consisted with a due regard to the interests of his own; and his wishes for its happiness were as ardent as was compatible with the duties of a chief magistrate to the state over which he presided." Washington had refused to use the words of Genet, to enter into "a true *family compact* which was for ever to unite the political and commercial interests of the two people."* Washington had also declined to sanction with his name an agreement for '*the respective naturalization of the French and American citizens' proposed by Mr. Jefferson*, and desired by the French nation"† under the flimsy pretext "of rendering a reciprocal exemption from tonnage duty in the ports of France, and the United States less offensive to the powers, who by virtue of treaties, would have had a right to claim a participation in the same advantages." Did these refusals to make of the two nations but one people, inspire the sentiment just quoted? Was this the ingratitude and injustice towards France it sufficed to arrest?

* For this family compact which France wished to form with the United States, see Genet's letter to the secretary of state, dated September 18, 1793.

† See part of instructions given by the French government to citizen Adet, and letter to secretary Randolph by Mr. Adet, of 12th July, 1795.

An American patriot can be attached to no country but his own. All foreign attachments lead insensibly and surely to subserviency to foreign interests. Hear on this point, the words of the great Washington, as delivered in his farewell address: "As avenues to foreign influence, in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion; to influence or awe the public councils. Such an attachment towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the *former* to be the *satellite* of the *latter*."

How near the United States are to be the satellites of France, I leave every American to judge.

In the French vocabulary, those citizens or subjects only of a foreign nation, devoted to France, are called patriots, all the others, partizans of England, monarchs or aristocrats.

Minister Fauchet, in his intercepted letter, before noted, mentions three of these patriots in particular. After speaking dispraisingly of certain persons who had balanced whether to join or oppose the western insurrection, he observes, "still there are patriots of whom I delight to entertain an idea worthy of that imposing title. Consult MONROE, *he is of this number*. He had apprised me of the men, whom the current of events had dragged along as bodies avoid of weight. His friend, MADISON, is also an honest man. JEFFERSON, on whom the patriots cast their eyes to succeed the president, had foreseen these crises."

Of Mr. Jefferson's claim to this "imposing title," some may think we have aleady said enough. We should, however, be unjust to our subject, were we to omit a few other instances.

While Mr. Jefferson, minister of the United States, at Paris, recommended a transfer of the debt due to France, to a company of Hollanders, who had proposed to purchase the same of France—Having stated the offer, he observes, "If there is *danger* of the public payments *not being punc-*

tual, I submit whether it may not be better that the *discontents which would thence arise*, should be *transferred* from a *court*, of whose *good will we have so much need*, *to the breasts of a private company*."

Congress referred the letter containing this iniquitous proposition, to the board of treasury, who in February, 1787, reported; that, according to their ideas, the proposed transfer, was both *unjust* and *impolitic*: unjust, because the nation would contract an engagement which there was no well grounded prospect of fulfilling; impolitic, because a failure in the payment of the interest on the debt transferred (which was inevitable) would justly blast all hopes of credit with the citizens of the United Netherlands, in future pressing exigencies of the union: the board therefore, gave it as their opinion, that it would be advisable for congress, *without delay*, *to instruct* their minister, at the court of France, to *forbear* giving his sanction to any such transfer. Congress adopted the report, and instructed Mr. Jefferson accordingly.

I have never learned what was his reflections on this treatment of his plan for filling the French treasury, at the expense of a Dutch company, and to the discredit of his country.

Again. By a resolution of the house of representatives, passed the 23d February, 1791, Mr. Jefferson, as secretary of state, was directed to report to congress, "the nature and extent of the commercial intercourse of the United States with foreign nations, and the measures which he should think proper to be adopted for the improvement of the commerce and navigation of the same."

After an interval of near three years, on the 16th September, 1793, Mr. Jefferson delivered in his report. It was the last of his official acts, and not the least expressive of his desire to arrest that system of ingratitude and injustice towards France, which he had so long and so unsuccessfully resisted.

It will suffice to refer to a few particulars to point out its object and design.

The report states, that our tobacco imported into Great Britain had paid one third sterling the pound, custom and excise, besides heavy expenses of collection, but omits to mention that the tobacco of all other countries paid three sixths, nearly treble that sum, although the book of rates, from which he derived the first fact, presented the second close by its side.

In other parts of the report, where he is obliged to state a commercial regulation of Great Britain favourable to our country, he always accompanies it with some detractive qualification. Thus after stating that our exports to Great Britain and her dominions were *twice as great* as to France and her dominions, he takes care to depreciate this advantage, by observing that the greater part of what the former received from us was re-exported to other countries.

He lays great stress upon the exclusion of our vessels from the British West India islands, but omits altogether noticing their free admission into the British East Indies.

He mentions the advantages we enjoy by the admission of our vessels into the French West Indies; but he is silent on the subject of their total exclusion from the French East Indies.

He states that our *woods* are free of duty in Great Britain, while those of other countries pay only *small* duties, whereas the woods of other countries paid very *high* duties.

He declared that France was ready to enter into a new commercial treaty on *fair* and *equal* principles, when it soon appeared, by the publication which Genet was induced to make of his instructions, that our becoming a party in the war, "a family compact" was to be the price of the proposed treaty.

He recommended hostile measures against Great Britain, on the supposition, that, being on so good a footing with us, in fact she was not disposed to enter into a treaty; though

soon after his quitting the office of secretary of state, a commercial treaty was concluded with that nation.

The writer from whom these facts are selected, very justly remarks on this project, that its operation would have been a phenomenon in politics and trade—a government attempting to *aid* commerce by throwing it into *confusion;* by *obstructing* the most essential channels in which it flowed, under the pretence of making it flow *more* freely; damming up the best *inlet* for the supplies which we wanted, by disturbing a beneficial course of things, in an experiment, precarious, if not desperate; by arresting the current of a prosperous and progressive navigation, to *transfer* it to other countries, and by making all this *mad work* in the criminal attempt, to *build up* the *manufacturers* and trade of *France* at the expense of the *United States.*

This project failed; but the embargo and other acts restrictive of our commerce and navigation afford melancholy evidence that its object has never been relinquished by its author.

But enough, perhaps, of Mr. Jefferson, for the present. Let us now speak of the other two *patriots*, Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, whom minister Fauchet delighted to contemplate, as men "worthy of that imposing title." And first of

MR. MADISON.

The national Gazette has been already noticed; and some circumstances respecting it detailed. We shall now mention the part Mr. Madison took in effecting its establishment. Mr. *Freneau*, as before observed, was attracted from New York, where he had conducted the Freeman's Journal, belonging to Childs and Swaine, to Philadelphia. His talents, as editor of a paper, were of course well known. We now state that the negociation, which induced him to remove to Philadelphia, including the salary of 200 dollars, for which he did nothing, was conducted by Mr. Madison, through a

lady, with whose mother Mr. Madison then lodged. It being no longer necessary to use concealment respecting the parties to and particulars of this transaction, the documents, if the fact shall be denied by Mr. Madison, with some other correspondence, can be produced.

In this newspaper, thus established by the instrumentality of Mr. Madison, he was also a writer. To all the other papers of the same kind, it gave the tone and subject. Against president Washington it was the most abusive; in favour of Genet, the most conspicuous.

Against the proclamation of neutrality, Mr. Madison likewise distinguished himself. In his pamphlet under the signature of *Helvidius*, he endeavours to prove that the president had no authority to issue it, and that the people were under no obligation to obey it. How much Genet was pleased with this performance, may be seen in his letter addressed to the secretary of state, on his recall, dated September 18, 1793. "I will send no other justification to France of my conduct. I will join only in support of the opinions I meant to profess, some writings which have been published here, such as those of Veritas, *Helvidius*, *&c.*"

The most known acts, in the order of time, which entitled Mr. Madison in the eye of *Fauchet* to the imposing name of Patriot, are his commercial resolutions. Their object being the same with Mr. Jefferson's commercial report, little need be added respecting them. Their advocates admitted they were meant to turn the *course of trade* from one nation to another, to *pull down* England and *build up* France. To suggestions of the unknown consequences of such an operation and that merchants, if left to themselves, would always find the best markets, Mr. Madison replied "there are the *strongest* reasons *not* to follow the mercantile opinion in this country: it might be the opinion of the very country of which we ought not to take council."* He observed that "by diverting the trade from Great Britain to France, *three hun-*

* Madison's speech (debates) p. 62.

dred thousand British manufacturers, who live by our custom, would be driven to poverty and despair :" and made this observation with as much apathy as Mr. Jefferson exhibited, when to appease the fears his correspondent entertained of insurrections in case of the rejection of the constitution, he bid him be of good cheer, for that "one rebellion in thirteen states in the course of eleven years, is but one for each state in a century and a half." †

These propositions were debated in congress from January till the 3d of February 1794, when after the first being agreed to, which Mr. Madison said decided nothing as to a discrimination between different nations, the contest was relinquished and the further consideration quietly permitted to be postponed.

The agency which Mr. Madison has since had in *regulating our commerce* is too well known, and its consequences too extensively and severely felt to need either special notice or commentary.

"Still there are patriots of whom I delight to entertain an idea worthy of that imposing title. Colonel *Monroe*, he is of this number."

MR. MONROE.

Let us now examine the merits of the patriot.

Mr. Morris, who had imprudently displeased the republic of France, at the instance of the committee of safety was recalled, and Monroe appointed to take his place. On the 2nd of August, 1794, Mr. Monroe arrived in Paris. A decree of the national convention, dated 9th May, 1793, authorising the seisure of enemy's property in neutral vessels, was at this time in full operation. Mr. Morris had remonstrated against it as a violation of the 23d and 24th articles of our treaty of amity and commerce, and was endeavouring to

† See a letter of his dated 20th December, 1787, before quoted.

procure its repeal, when he was superceded. The effects of this decree were complained of from one end of the union to the other.

On the third of September, Mr. Monroe presented to the committee of public safety, his first state paper. In this he requests payment of the claims of our citizens for supplies, compensation for the embargo at Bordeaux, and for the injuries to our commerce, in consequence of the departure on their part, from the 23d and 24th articles of the treaty. On this last subject, after shewing by many pertinent remarks, that it was the interest of France to repeal the decree, he concludes with these remarkable words: "It is my *duty* to observe to you that I am under no instruction to *complain* of, or request a repeal of the decree authorising a departure from the 23d and 24th articles of the treaty of amity and commerce; on the contrary, I *well know that if upon consideration, after the experiment made, you should be of opinion, that it produces any solid benefit to the republic; the American government and my countrymen in general, will not only bear the departure with patience, but with pleasure.*"

On the 16th of October, he presented another note, in which he says "I shall add nothing respecting the contravention of the treaty, to change the *principle* upon which I rested it." What was that principle? Simply, that it was the *interest* of France to repeal the decree, and conform to the treaty; but if the committee thought the good of France would be promoted by the decree, the United States would bear with pleasure, whatever losses and exaction our commerce should suffer, under its operation.

Again at a conference with Merlin de Douay, Thuriot and Treilard, a diplomatic branch of the committee to which he was invited; these gentlemen, after observing "that they were persuaded their compliance with the treaty would be useful to the United States, but very detrimental to them," asked Mr. Monroe, whether he insisted on its execution, to which he replied, "he had nothing new to add to what he had already said on that head." Thus finally and explicitly

conceding on his part, so far as he could concede, that these articles might be disregarded by France.

So glaring a departure from his instructions, so barefaced a relinquishment of our rights, such an open encouragement of France in her system of perfidy and depredation, drew from the executive the following reprimand :* "You say that you have not been instructed to desire a repeal of the decree which violated the 23d and 24th articles of the treaty of commerce. That you did not know but it had been tolerated from the soundest motives of political expedience, lest the demand for rescinding it, might produce a call for the guarantee. Indeed you have gone further; having declared in your memorial, that you were under no *instructions* to complain of, or request the repeal of the decree authorising a departure from these articles, and, "that if upon re-consideration, after the experiment be made, the committee of public safety should be of opinion, that it produces any solid benefit to the French republic, the American government, and your countrymen in general, would not only bear the departure with patience, but with pleasure."

"The fourth head of injury stated in your letter, shews that you was possesed of cases that turned entirely on the impropriety of the decree, and such too was certainly the fact. Now without the abrogation of the decree, so far as it respects those cases, the redress which you were instructed to demand, could not be obtained. In truth, there was no cause or pretence for asking relief, but upon the ground of that decree having violated the treaty. Does not this view lead to the inevitable consequence that the decree, if operative in future instances, would be no less disagreeable, and consequently that its operation in future instances, ought to be prevented, a circumstance which could be accomplished only by a total repeal? The papers of the ship Laurens, contained a reference to one or more representations of Mr. Morris, against the decree; so that the business had been

* See Mr. Secretary's letter, dated 2d December, 1794.

actually broken to the French government. Neither these representations, nor yet your application, appears to have suggested a requisition of the guarantee.

" But my good sir, let these things be as they will, was it necessary to intimate that an indifference prevailed in our government as to those articles, by a declaration that you were not instructed to complain of the decree? I confess I am unapprised of the data upon which such an opinion could be founded; and undoubtedly the president himself would not undertake that the people of the United States would bear with patience a departure from stipulations which are generally believed to be important to us."

This gratuitous surrender of our commerce, by this minister to the discretion of France, was succeeded by two other instances of condescention no less abject and disgraceful.

Our government having determined before an appeal to arms, to address Great Britain in a solemn embassy upon the subject of our complaints, the secretary of state informed Mr. Monroe, that Mr. Jay, who was charged with this mission, was " positively forbidden to weaken the engagements between this country and France, and that the motives of the mission were to obtain immediate compensation for our plundered property, and restitution of the posts."

At an interview with the French diplomatic committee, sought and obtained by Mr. Monroe, as stated in his letter to secretary Randolph, dated the 2d December, 1794, he promised the committee most unnecessarily and improperly, to communicate to them the stipulations of the treaty negociated with Great Britain, as soon as they should be known to him, and not to be wanting in fulfilling this promise, before the treaty could possibly have been sent to the United States, he dispatched a special messenger to London to obtain a copy *for the express purpose of laying it before the French government.*

From the letters that passed between Mr. Jay and Mr. Monroe on this occasion, it appears, that Mr. Jay informed Mr. Monroe, that the treaty contained a declaration that it

shall not be considered, nor operate contrary to our existing treaties, and besides repeatedly offered to communicate to him *confidentially* the particulars of the treaty, but that he refused to receive the information unless he was left at liberty to submit the whole to the inspection of the committee. In Mr. Monroe's last attempt to draw it from Mr. Jay, he observes "as nothing will satisfy this government but a copy of the instrument itself, and which as our ally, it thinks itself entitled to; so it will be useless for me to make to it any new communication short of that. I mention this, that you may know precisely the state of my engagements here, and how I deem it my duty to act under them in relation to this object."

In giving the letter of Mr. Jay entire, in answer to this application, I am sure I shall please my readers of whatever party, who still retain the feelings natural to Americans. It is in the following words:

"SIR—I have received the letter you did me the honour to write on the 17th of last month by Mr. Purviance.

"It is much to be regretted that any unauthorised accounts in English newspapers of my adjustment with the British administration, should have excited much uneasiness in the councils of the French government; and the more so, as it does not imply that confidence in the honour and good faith of the United States, which they certainly merit. You must be sensible that the United States as a free and independent nation, have an unquestionable right to make any pacific arrangements with other powers which mutual convenience may dictate; provided those arrangements do not contradict or oppugn their prior engagements with other states.

Whether this adjustment was consistent with our treaty with France, struck me as being the only question which could demand or receive the consideration of that republic; and I thought it due to the friendship subsisting between the two countries, that the French government should have, without delay, the most perfect satisfaction on that head. I therefore, by three letters, viz. the 24th, 25th, and 28th of

November, 1794, gave you what I hoped would be very acceptable and satisfactory information on that point: I am happy in this opportunity of giving you an exact and literal extract from the treaty; it is in these words, viz.

"Nothing in this treaty contained, shall however be construed or operate contrary to former or existing public treaties with other sovereigns or states."

"Considering that events favourable to our country could not fail to give you pleasure, I did intend to communicate to you concisely some of the most interesting particulars of this treaty, but in *the most perfect confidence*. As that instrument has not yet been ratified, nor received the ultimate forms to give it validity; as further questions respecting parts of it, may yet arise and give occasion to further discussions and negociations, so that if finally concluded at all, it may then be different from what it now is, the impropriety of making it public, at present, is palpable and obvious. Such a proceeding would be inconvenient and unprecedented. It does not belong to ministers who negociate treaties to publish them, even when perfected, much less treaties not yet completed, and remaining open to alteration or rejection; such acts also belong exclusively to the governments who form them.

"I cannot but flatter myself that the present government is too enlightened and reasonable, to expect that any consideration ought to induce me to overlook the bounds of my authority, or to be negligent of the respect which is due to the United States. *That respect and my obligations to observe it, will not permit me to give, without the permission of their government, a copy of the instrument in question to any person, or for any purpose; and by no means for the purpose of being submitted to the consideration and judgment of the councils of a foreign nation, however friendly. I will, sir, take the earliest opportunity of transmitting a copy of your letter to me, and of this answer to the secretary of state, and will immediately and punctually execute such orders and instructions as I may receive on the subject.*"

It must occur to every person the least conversant with the views of France, that so great was her hostility to Great Britain, that no treaty whatever which arranged our differences with that nation, could have been acceptable, and that her eagerness to obtain a copy of the instrument, had no other object than to enable her to interfere, with effect, in our national contracts. When had France exhibited to the president any of her treaties before or after their ratification? What gave to France a right to demand from the United States, what the United States had no right to demand of France?

This unsuccessful attempt on Mr. Jay, did not abate his ardour to procure for the French committee, a sight of this treaty. When major Pinckney was at Paris, on his way to Madrid, Mr. Monroe represented to him, that France was inclined to give them every aid to forward his negociation with Spain, if he would *desire* it, and also *satisfy* the committee respecting the treaty negotiated with Great Britain. As one of the conditions of this proposed aid was the disclosure of the treaty, Mr. Pinkney influenced by the reasons which operated on Mr. Jay, refused to shew the treaty, and of course, to ask the *aid* of France in his negotiation.

In these attempts to obtain a copy of the treaty, we can only see a fixed determination to defeat it. Such patriotism would be discredited by many; did the proofs depend on other evidence than his own. "We are made fast," said he, on his return from France, "by treaty and by the spirit of those at the helm, to a nation bankrupt in its resources and rapidly verging either to anarchy or despotism."*

On the 30th of November, 1794, in a letter to Mr. Randolph, secretary of state, he observes, I was invited by the diplomatique members of the committee of public safety, to a conference on a new topic. I was informed it was their intention to press the war against England, in particular, but that they were distressed for funds, and was asked could any

* See his view of the conduct of the executive, p. 66.

aid be obtained from the United States. I told him, *I was satisfied, if it was in their power, it would be rendered;* that I possessed no power on the subject, and could only *advise* on the probability, &c. but with their permission, I would put on paper such ideas as occurred to me in respect to that point, and upon which I would afterwards more fully confer," &c. He continues :

" No other arrangement can well be made, than that of lending money to France, if in our power ; it *being understood* she will secure, *at the time of her own peace* the complete recognition of our rights from *Britain* and *Spain*, and which she may easily do, in my judgment, and without prolonging the war a moment on that account," &c. He next extols the power and successes of France, and then adds. " In any event it will produce such effect, that if America *strikes the blow her own interest dictates*, and every other consideration prompts, it must be decisive ; and if not ruinous to the fortunes of that proud and insolent nation, will certainly procure us the objects we have in view."

The following is an extract from the paper he promised the committee. " It is the wish of the French republic to obtain by loan a sum of money from the United States of America, to enable it to prosecute the war. This is to be expected from three sources ; the general government, the state governments, and from individuals. The French cause and the French nation are greatly regarded in America, and *I am persuaded some money may be obtained and perhaps a very respectable sum* from the three socurces above mentioned. For this purpose the minister should possess power to make loans from either of the above parties, and to give such security as the republic shall deem suitable," &c.

He states in one of his letters, the loan wanted would be five millions of dollars, and in his justificatory letter of the 12th of February, 1795, he says " at that time, I had reason to believe, that it (France) *contemplated to take under its care* and provide for our protection against Algiers, for the expulsion of the British from the western posts, and the

establishment of our rights with Spain, to the free navigation of the Mississippi."

This recommendation to our government to strike a blow which would be ruinous to Great Britain, you will observe, was made *pending* the negotiation with that power. Consequently war with Great Britain was preferred to the most advantageous arrangement: The loan too which he recommended was actually a war measure, because a loan could not have been made to either belligerent, without a violation of neutrality. But this is not the worst aspect of the subject. Mr. Monroe *at the time* he encouraged the French republic in a project to obtain a loan from the United States, to enable her to prosecute the war, had in his possession, Mr. Randolph's letter, dated June 10th, 1794, in which the secretary expressly tells him, " we are unable to give her aids *of men or money.*" What but the most ardent devotion to France, or a degree of *insanity* could have compelled him to violate this instruction, and how could he be *persuaded* with his instructions in his pocket, that " the people would cheerfully bear a tax, the product of which was to be applied in aid of the French republic." And what was the equivalent we were to receive from France, for this surrender of our neutrality, and placing our rights in her keeping ? What we have attained without her assistance. France forsooth was to procure for us, when she should *make peace*, the navigation of the Mississippi, the western posts, to provide for our protection against Algiers. Consequently, become a dependent, we must have administered to the war, to our last cent, have remained during its progress without compensation for spoliations on our commerce, deprived of the western posts, and excluded from the Mississippi, and at length when peace should take place, be disposed of by France, according to the state of things, *at the moment*, or the view and interest of the preponderating power.

I shall now advert to some facts common to these three patriots. Mr. Monroe at the time we are speaking of, acted in concert with Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison. Their

system was his system, their policy, his politics. No commercial treaty with Great Britain was a dogma with all, and with each of them. When Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison got into power, the one as president, the other as secretary of state, they still adhered to this system.

Mr. Madison in his dispatch to Mr. Monroe, dated 5th March, 1804, after observing that the commercial articles of the treaty, of 1794, with Great Britain, had expired, and making some remarks on the trade to the *East* and *West-Indies*, proceeds to tell him that he does not offer "these observations with a view to any negotiations whatever, *leading* at the present moment, to a treaty on *those* or any other *commercial points*." From the same letter it appears, "the commercial intercourse between the two countries, was to be left to the regulations which the parties separately might *think fit* to establish."

Again, in a conversation between lord Harrowby and Mr. Monroe, as given in a dispatch from the latter to Mr. Madison, dated August 7th, 1804, Lord Harrowby asks, "the commercial part of the treaty being considered as expired, what is the subsisting relation between the two countries? Are we in the state we were at the close of the American war? By what rule is our intercourse to be governed respecting tonnage, imports, and the like?" To this Mr. Monroe replied, "the *law* in each country would *regulate* these points." Lord Harrowby wished to know how far it would be agreeable to our goverment to stipulate that the treaty of 1794, should remain in force until two years should expire after the conclusion of the present war? To this Mr. Monroe answers, "He had no power to agree to such proposal, that the president, animated by a sincere desire to cherish and perpetuate the friendly relations subsisting between the two countries was disposed to *postpone* the regulation of their general commercial system till *peace*.

The consequences of this new way of "perpetuating the friendly relations subsisting between the two countries," by postponing commercial regulations to a time of peace, began

soon to be felt, and by the year 1806 drew forth a call upon government from all parts of the union, for an arrangement with Great Britain, of the principles of navigation and commerce.

Not daring to resist the strength of this current, the cabinet *seemed* to give way; and in April 1806, appointed Mr. Monroe and Mr. Wm. Pinkney commissioners extraordinary and plenipotentiary, "to settle all matters of difference between the United States and the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, relative to wrongs, committed between the parties on the high seas or other waters, and for establishing the principles of navigation and commerce between them." On the 27th of December, 1806, the commissioners informed Mr. Madison: "We have this day agreed with the British commissioners to conclude a treaty on *all the points* which had formed the object of our negotiation, and on terms which we trust our government will approve."

We all know the result of this accommodation. The treaty was rejected by Mr. *Jefferson*, almost as soon as read, and returned to the commissioners without being submitted to the senate: who, it is probable, would have consented and advised to its ratification.

The current, which had produced this deceptious mission, having abated, the new instructions to the commissioners, proposed such modifications and alterations as effectually precluded all possibility of any arrangement whatever with Great Britain,* while they held out in smooth and flattering expressions, a sincere and anxious wish for a friendly and speedy arrangement of all matters in dispute.

"It is usual among christian people at war," said the venerable Franklin, in a letter addressed to Richard Oswald, the English negotiator, "to profess always a desire of peace. But if ministers of one of the parties choose to insist particularly on a certain article which they have known, the others are not, and cannot be empowered to agree to,

* See Mr. Madison's letter to Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney, dated 20th May, 1807, &c. &c. &c.

what credit can they expect should be given to such professions."*

I shall add to this article, a circumstance which glances at a secret, which our cabinet has in vain attempted to conceal, which for years past has afflicted our country and dictated the measures of a weak and confiding Congress. Mr. Monroe when minister at the court of London in a letter, dated October 3d, 1804, to Mr. Madison, observes, " matters are arrived at that state, the president may either, in a few months, renew negotiation, or act with *moderation*, till the occasion invites to a more *decisive and hazardous policy*." What is meant by this " more decisive and hazardous policy?" Does it consist in the measures since adopted, that have brought upon our country so many misfortunes?

When Mr. Jefferson advised congress to pass the embargo act, our capital amounted to 200,000,000 dollars, since which a great part of this capital has been swallowed up by the piracies, sequestrations and reprisals of Bonaparte. In 1807 (the date of the embargo) our revenue was equal to sixteen millions of dollars. In 1808 it was reduced to 10,000,332 dollars. In 1809 it was further reduced to 6,500,000 making a difference of 9,500,000 dollars in this short period, and, as we proceed, all revenue derivable from trade, must soon be wholly at an end.

In 1807, the English orders in council left ports open to the United States, which received of our domestic produce 38,937,388 dollars, and of foreign produce carried in our shipping 24,140,495 dollars, making an aggregate exportation amounting to 63,077,883 dollars; a commerce greater and more extensive, than any we can calculate upon in time of peace.

The reports of Mr. Gallatin, from which these facts are drawn, further shew, that in 1806, the year preceding the embargo, there remained of revenue, after defraying all the expenses of government, a surplus of five and an half millions

* See the letter dated Passy, November 26, 1782.

of dollars; but that the present year, instead of possessing this revenue, requires a loan of four millions of dollars to meet only the customary peace expenses of government.

Mr. Robert Smith, a co-operator in the measures, that have produced these effects, in an address to the people of the United States, explanatory of the causes, which occasioned his resignation of the office of secretary of state, has exhibited such an internal view of the cabinet at Washington, as cannot fail to alarm the least thoughtful and destroy the faith of the most confiding. His disclosures confirm all that is here said or suggested. No one can rise from reading them, and not assent to Fauchet's encomium, in the French acceptation of the phrase, "that Mr. Madison is a patriot worthy of that imposing title."

As the address will, no doubt, be perused by most of you, I shall only select from it the following particulars.

1st. That the Erskine affair was a *cabinet intrigue*, in which the ex-secretary himself, as would seem, was made to play the part of the dupe. That he did not see Mr. Erskine's instructions *in extenso*, but insinuates that they were not unknown to Mr. Madison, and Mr. Gallatin. That Mr. Madison caused to be added to the ratification of the agreement, on the part of the United States, a sentence, casting foul dishonour in the teeth of the British monarch, calculated to inflame every artery and vein of the king and nation, and in itself sufficient, in case Erskine's departure from his instructions had failed, to insure the rejection of the agreement.

The inference the ex-secretary leaves to be drawn from this disclosure, is, that our cabinet will negociate with Great Britain, whenever a purpose is to be answered, but will always provide against a ratification.

2nd. It appears that Macon's bills, No. 1, and No. 2, were children of Mr. Madison's political system, conveyed by a secret and special contrivance, into the hands of Mr. Macon, by which means Mr. Madison fixed upon others, all the odium of measures, which, in the words of the secre-

tary, "were alike regardless of the prosperity and of the honour of the United States."

3d. The *non-intercourse law* of the last session, the ex-secretary states to be also a *device* of Mr. Madison, and, that its *enactment* was procured by his machinery after the arrival of the French minister Serrurier at Washington, and after Mr. Madison was fully assured Bonaparte had not and would not comply with *his part* of the compact.

4th. That Mr. Smith communicated to Mr. Madison the result of a conversation he had with Serrurier on this subject, with the draft of a letter to that minister, which with his answer thereto, would have put the information on record; but to his astonishment, was told by Mr. Madison, it would not be *expedient* to send to Mr. Serrurier any such note. Notwithstanding this impulse, the ex-secretary alledges "having nothing in view but the dignity of the government and prosperity of his country," he intreated him "not to withhold from congress any information that might be useful to them at so momentous a juncture." The information was withheld notwithstanding this remonstrance, and the non-intercourse bill, which had been suspended for information from France, passed into a law.

5th. All of you may not have at hand the duke of Cadore's letter to general Armstrong, dated the 14th of February, 1810. The following extract from it may serve to remind you of its nature:

"His majesty could place no reliance on the proceedings of the United States, who having no ground of complaint against France, comprised her in their acts of exclusion, and since the month of May, have forbidden the entrance of their ports to French vessels under the penalty of confiscation. As soon as his majesty was informed of this measure, he considered himself bound to order reprisals on American vessels not only in his territory, but likewise in the countries which are under his influence. In the ports of Holland, of Spain, of Italy, and of Naples, American vessels have been seized, because the Americans have seized French ves-

sels. The Americans cannot hesitate, as to the part which they are to take. They ought either to *tear to pieces the act of their independence*, and to become again, as before the revolution, the *subjects of England*, or to take such measures as that their commerce and industry should not be tariffed by the English, which renders them more dependent than Jamaica, which at least, has its assembly of representatives, and its privileges. Men without *just political views*, *without honour*, *without energy*, may alledge that payment of the tribute imposed by England, may be submitted to, because it is light; but why will they not perceive that the English will no sooner have obtained the admission of the principle, than they will raise the tariff in such way that the burthen at first light, becoming insupportable, it will then be necessary to fight for interest, after having refused to fight for *honour*."

To this extraordinary dispatch, the ex-secretary ordered the draught of an answer for general Armstrong, which the president would not permit to be sent to him. You will see when you read this letter, as reported in his pamphlet, that while the ex-secretary respects the dignity, and upholds the rights of his insulted country, he overlooks none of the observations of decorum. It thus concludes, " these observations you will not fail to present to the view of the French government, in order that the emperor may learn, that the United States insist upon nothing but their acknowledged rights, and that they still entertain a desire to adjust all differences with the government of France, upon a basis equally beneficial and honourable to both nations."

Instead of this letter so mild and yet so proper, Mr. Madison directed no other notice to be taken of the duke's, than the following paragraph, which was added to another letter, of the 5th of June, 1810.

" As the John Adams is daily expected, and as your further communications by her, will better enable me to adapt to the actual state of our affairs with the French government, the observations proper to be made in relation to their sei-

zure of our property, and to the letter of the duke of Cadore, of the 14th February, it is by the president deemed expedient *not to make, at this time, any such animadversions. I* cannot, however, forbear *informing you*, that a high indignation is felt by the president as well as by the public, at this act of violence on our property, and at the outrage, both in the language and in the matter, of the letter of the duke of Cadore, so justly portrayed in your note to him, of the 10th of March."

I shall notice but another item, as no doubt all who read this, will read Mr. Smith's address to the people of the United States.

6th. The ex-secretary, Mr. Madison, without any appropriation or sanction by law, directed Mr. Erving, United States agent, in London, to retain for his services, 22,392 dollars out of monies the property of individuals, for claims allowed under the British treaty ; and that this extra compensation, was not for extra services ; but for the express services for which, a salary of 2,000 dollars, was originally allowed.

Such my fellow citizens, is a part of the confessions of this ex-secretary. I was about to express a regret, that he had deemed it expedient to conceal others of equal, if not greater magnitude : but more confessions were unnecessary, to shew the policy of his principal, and his just claims, in the French acceptation of the term, to the imposing title of *patriot.*

To what a sad situation is our country reduced ; plundered of its property, without any manly effort to protect it, cramped in its industry, and not daring to complain, shackled in its commerce, and joining in measures to destroy it ; sunk in its character, and courting its defamer ; the government itself, the shadowy form of independence, floating on the waves of uncertain events.

Such is the picture it presents. If the people are satisfied with it, the Lord have mercy upon us. We are given up to Bonaparte. We are devoted to destruction !

But the people will not conspire in their own destruction ;

they are not yet become the degraded tools and passive instrument of Bonaparte. They have twice saved the country with Washington at their head, once in war, and once in peace; and under providence, they will save it a third time!

I have now performed in part, what I proposed. These facts, or I am greatly mistaken, fully explain the series of causes which have led to the present state of things. It remains, therefore, only to shew, by what means our country may regain the station it has lost.

You perceive a community which has been artfully divided into political sects by the assistance of a few words and phrases of perverted meaning. You now know for a certainty who are the introducers and propagators of these words and phrases You find your commerce gone, your revenue nearly destroyed, and much of your property in the hands of Bonaparte. You are also acquainted with the measures by which these effects were produced. And you are no longer ignorant of the men whose advice and management procured them. You have observed three of the most prominent statemen designated as the peculiar favourites of France, and you have witnessed how well these individuals have justified the distinction. Without bringing these things fully to view, I should not have fulfilled the task I had undertaken. But I judge—I condemn no one. I have not dared to enquire into motives. God forbid I should assume a faculty which belongs only to God. I have laid before you facts, not with the view to furnish matter for abuse or censure, but to prove to you the necessity of infusing into your state government, while yet in your power, a new spirit, and new principles. If you wish a change in the measures of the general government, it is here you must begin the change.

The Senate of Maryland once filled a great space in the public estimation. It numbered among its members, names still dear to their country. May the angels who presides over the destines of Maryland be permitted to inspire you to chuse for electors, such men as will elect Senators worthy to fill the seats once occupied by those estimable characters!

Our State Constitution lays down the rule to be observed on this occasion. It ordains that those having a right of suffrage shall chuse for electors of the senate "the most wise, sensible and discreet of the people" and that the persons thus elected should in their turn chuse for senators "men of the most wisdom, experience and virtue."

The Constitution summons, good men of every party to lend their aid in making this selection. It calls upon them to unite for this object. It is for them to explain to the uninformed and misguided, the safety to the republic in a virtuous and experienced Senate. The poor wise man knows, that to him as well as to the rich, good laws are a blessing.

Are any ignorant that it is on the individual state government the general government is erected, and that if the former are undermined the latter must be proportionably affected? To keep the foundation work sound and entire, is to keep the general government sound and in full strength. To preserve the latter in this condition, besides the universal obligation upon every citizen to promote the public good, our Constitution particularly enjoins that voters shall chuse for electors "the most wise, sensible and discreet of the people," and that electors shall chuse for senators "men of the most wisdom, experience and virtue." Every voter and elector therefore who observes a different rule, violates the Constitution and disregards a solemn obligation.

To you my fellow citizens the inestimable right of *suffrage* belongs. If it has been sullied by any base practices, restore it to its purity. It is the spirit of the Constitution with which and with every part of which, it holds an indissoluble union. It is the fountain from which flows all good laws. If corrupted, all the streams which flow from it must be corrupted also.

In every case like the present, where a great effort is required, no virtuous citizen can remain inactive or indifferent. Men without exception are bound to promote by all

justifiable means the happiness of the society of which they are members. To disregard this law, is to dissolve society. In every community the good are mixed with the bad. Among the latter there is a constant effort to encroach upon the rights of the former. For this reason society has a double claim on the exertions of the good, in carrying on the great work of government, which is social happiness. A good man, therefore, fails in his duty whenever through inaction he permits an evil to take root in the republic, or throws upon others a burden which he himself ought to have borne. Does any one wish to withdraw his shoulder from the burden, let him suspect the soundness of his patriotism. Patriotism is an active virtue: its principle, honour; the constitution its rule; the choice of good men its object, and the welfare of the state the end of its operations. To vote, is an appointed service all have to perform; and the election ground the place to perform it. Patriotism, like wisdom, is gentle and easy to be entreated, full of good fruits, without *partiality* and without *hypocrisy*. It is gentle; it deals in no unmerited censures; it abounds in forbearance, and would win men over to its side, more by courtesy than by crabbedness. It lends a willing ear to advice, and receives information with a sincere desire to turn it to advantage. It is full of good fruits. It does not yield to criminal torpor, to lukewarmness or indifference in times that require zeal and exertion; it serves the holy cause of the constitution, not with its lips merely, but in works as well as in words. It is without partiality. It draws no needless or unwarrantable distinctions between candidates; it renders equal justice to competitors, in proportion to their respective merits. It is without *hypocrisy*. It puts on no delusive exterior; it is a steadfast observer of truth. It will submit to lose what it most desires, rather than gain it by falsehood, prevarication, deception or dishonest dealing.

We are told by the highest authority, "it is good to be zealously affected in a good thing." Shew yourselves therefore zealous for the election of good men into our public

councils; but let your zeal be free from indiscretion, intolerance or enthusiasm. Genuine zeal is of a different character. It is fearless, yet offends not; strenuous, yet mild; steadfast, yet meek; earnest, yet prudent. It is known by its effects. It stimulates to virtuous exertion. It renders him who feels it, more capable of resisting whatever obstacle may arise to obstruct the fair exercise of his right; more constant in pursuing the path pointed out by the constitution, more desirous of directing his views to the characters which it designates, than to force the election of men designated by a party.

Whoever is indifferent on this subject, let him suspect the soundness of his patriotism. Can the man who loves his country, refuse one day's labour in five years for its benefit? Some are so unfortunate as always to be indisposed on the day of election. Others from an unexpected occurrence of business which never fails to occur, on that day, cannot possibly attend. This one stays at home to favour some pitiful interest. That one is seized with such an unaccountable fit of laziness as to unfit him for motion. Others are always absent on a little journey or excursion which could not be postponed; and there are those, to whom a few threatening clouds, a little rain, a lame horse, a broken shin or a tooth ache serve as a standing apology for a neglect and contempt of one of the most important of their civil obligations. Is this "being zealously affected in a good thing?" Is this fulfilling the duty of a good citizen? Is this observing the constitution?

If citizens will neglect their stipulated services, and remain at home on such occasions, relying on the patriotic efforts of the majority, to keep things right, what security can they give to the republic, that the vices instead of the virtues of the community, shall not preponderate. For a little self-indulgence, to avoid a slight exertion, a walk or ride of a few miles, they will put at risk the benefit of civil liberty, and all the untold blessings that result from equal laws. To do nothing in such a case, to remain at home, and inactive, is something worse than being useless. Is the safety of our

country, the object of your regard? Do the evils under which it labours, and the calamities impending over it, give you no disquietude? Do the privileges you may exercise under the constitution, excite no anxiety for their preservation? Can the constitution be preserved, if the right of suffrage be neglected? It requires you to select "the most wise, sensible and discreet of the people for electors of the senate." Can you do this by staying at home? Away then with all trivial excuses. Claim your rights, appear at the polls in your several election districts, and vote as the constitution enjoins; and leave the issue to the author of all good, and punisher of evil.

When arrived at the polls, be vigilant to detect, and resolute in repelling every attempt to corrupt the source of our liberty, by the introduction of illegal votes. There are creatures so devoid of reflection or so shamefully depraved, as to make a merchandize of the most important article in the inventory of the rights of Freemen. In all such transactions, the seller and the buyer, are equally guilty of a crime against liberty, and the constitution. There are men also, who do not scruple, in borrowed dresses to vote, when not prevented by the vigilance of bye-standers, oftener than once, and some judges of elections are said to have shut their eyes to such criminal practices. Let such remember, if such there be, that in all these cases, judges may be prosecuted, and the offenders punished.

Having used your best exertions to carry the intention of our constitution into effect, and done every thing in your power, to prevent the reign of evil, though all should prove unavailing, still there will remain this touching satisfaction, that you have not trenched upon the constitutional rights, nor been indifferent and unconcerned at the situation of your country, or sacrificed its interest at the shrine of a party, to keep or to place unworthy men in power. Yours, therefore, will be the merit, yours, the reward of fidelity to the laws; and the enviable recollection, of having done your duty.

FINIS.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 003 863 046 5